

REMARKS

Claims 1-21

Claims 1-3, 7 and 10-12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Petersen et al. (U.S. Patent 6,747,954).

Claim 4 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Petersen in view of Yamato et al. (U.S. Patent 6,094,431).

Claims 5 and 6 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Petersen in view of St. John (U.S. Patent 6,917,591).

Claim 8 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Petersen in view of Basso (U.S. Patent 6,937,606).

Claim 9 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Petersen in view of St. John and Kloth et al. (U.S. Patent 6,868,065).

Claim 21 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Petersen in view of Caldara et al. (U.S. Patent 5,982,771).

The Examiner has objected to Claims 13-20 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. However, the Examiner has indicated that these claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of dependent Claim 13, and Claim 13 has been canceled. The Applicants have effectively amended Claim 1 in accordance with the Examiner's suggestions, such that Claim 1 is now allowable. Claims 2-12 and 14-21, which depend from amended Claim 1, are allowable for at least the same reasons as Claim 1.

Claims 22-27

Claims 22-25 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Buhrgard et al. (U.S. Patent 6,671,255).

Claim 26 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Buhrgard et al. in view of Manning et al. (U.S. Patent 6,167,452).

Claim 27 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Buhrgard et al. in view of Petersen et al.

Applicants have canceled claims 22-27, therefore rendering the rejection of these claims moot.

Claims 28-33

The Applicants have added new Claims 28-33. Support for these new claims exists in the specification as originally filed. No new matter is added.

Claim 28 recites "making a prediction within the line card as to whether the queue is full, wherein the prediction is made in response to user internal frames transmitted from the line card". Thus, Claim 28 is allowable for reasons similar to amended Claim 1. Claims 29-33, which depend from Claim 28, are allowable for at least the same reasons as Claim 28.

CONCLUSION

Claims 1-12, 14-21 and 28-33 are pending in the present application. Reconsideration and allowance of these claims is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions or comments, he is invited to call the undersigned at (925) 895-3545.

Respectfully submitted,



Customer No. 027158

E. Eric Hoffman

Reg. No. 38,186

Attorney for Applicant

Tel. No.: (925) 895-3545

BEVER, HOFFMAN & HARMS, LLP

Fax No.: (925) 371-8187

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as FIRST CLASS MAIL in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA, 22313-1450.

March 8, 2006  
Date

Carrie Reddick  
Signature: Carrie Reddick